

# CONTENTS

In Memoriam . . . . .	1
Official Divisional Business	
Highlights of the Winter Executive Committee Meeting	2
Announcements	
Division 14 Workshop . . . . .	6
Early Registration . . . . .	9
Primer Congreso Nacional de psicologia Industrial	10
Research Notes	
Exec Com Hears Survey Report . . . . .	12
The Demand for Service - An Informal Survey . . . . .	13
I Am Never Startled By a Fish . . . . .	22
Professional Notes	
APA Convention, 1972 . . . . .	27
Report on Division 14 Public Relations Survey.	28
Editor's Note . . . . .	32
Division 14 Committee Structure . . . . .	Inside Back Cover
Newsletter Staff . . . . .	Back Cover

The impact of Industrial and Organizational Psychology is a little less as this issue of TIP goes to press. Ed. Henry died of leukemia on December 5 in Rochester, N.Y. APA and Division 14 activities will never be quite the same.

Ed's career of over 40 years as a psychologist touched an amazing number of individuals and organizations. A simple listing of jobs held, organization memberships and honors bestowed would require many lines of agate type. If Ed saw such a list, he would say, "Hogwash!" or something more pungent. But certainly we can note as highlights his contribution to the teaching of Industrial Psychology, Army Personnel Research, consultation undergirt by sound research, application of psychology within a corporate setting, Peace Corps selection, and upgrading the stature and acceptance of psychologists.

The young psychologists of today and tomorrow will scarcely realize Ed's influence. Graduate school reading lists are not likely to include anything with his name on it. Ed had no time to publish. True, his wife suffered through the movement from attic to attic of innumerable boxes filled with partially analyzed data or even completed studies which were to be translated into appropriately formatted journal articles. Somehow there was always an immediate problem, opportunity, or challenge which took precedence.

Ed's influence was through people. No problem was too trivial, no individual so insignificant, no hour too late to prevent Ed from complete absorption in the situation. Hundreds of psychologists can attest to this and many have given him the sincerest form of tribute, emulation.

Ed's wish to us would probably be, "May your hole card be at least paired."

*C. Paul Sparks*

## HIGHLIGHTS OF THE WINTER EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

The Executive Committee and Committee Chairmen met in Washington, D. C. on January 14 & 15. Our President, Doug Bray, presided over the meeting.

Don Grant reported that our Division Account had a balance of \$130 at the end of 1971, contrasted with a deficit of \$1700 at the end of 1970. The current balance is \$7100. Don also reported that the Division had received a grant of \$5000 from the James McKeen Cattell Fund. The grant insures continuation of the Cattell competition for several years.

Bob Carlson reported for Ed Lawler on the activities of the Education and Training Committee. Two items were discussed at length, i.e., a possible invitational conference on the education and training of industrial and organizational psychologists and accreditation of graduate programs in industrial and organizational psychology. No decisions were reached with regard to either topic but both will be given further consideration at future meetings.

Mary Tenopyr reported on the survey conducted by the Education and Training Committee with respect to communications among industrial and organizational psychologists. All members of the Division responded to the survey. The majority of the respondents indicated satisfaction with present communications. Some dissatisfaction was indicated, however, and a number of specific suggestions were offered for improving communications. The report on the survey is a lengthy one. Possibilities for publishing the report were reviewed.

Ralph Canter reported that requests for nominations of Fellow candidates had been mailed to all Fellows of the Division. The Fellowship Committee hopes that there will be a good response to the request. It will begin reviewing the nominations once they are received. With respect to a particular case that has come up recently, the Executive Committee voted to require any previous Member and/or Fellow of our Division reapplying for membership in the Division to go through prescribed procedures for making such application.

Jim Glennon reported on the views of the Membership Committee with regard to admitting persons with MA degrees to full membership in APA. Following discussion of Jim's report, the Executive Committee set up a committee to explore the issues involved in depth and to report its recommendations

at the June meeting of the Executive Committee. The committee consists of Jim Glennon, Chairman, Ed Lawler, and Paul Sparks.

Paul Sparks reported that the Professional Affairs Committee recommends that no new standing committee be established on the practice of industrial and organizational psychology. Instead, his Committee proposed, and the Executive Committee concurred, that the Professional Affairs Committee assume this function. In addition to this action, the Executive Committee voted to instruct the Professional Affairs Committee to submit a program proposal to the Program Committee regarding issues involved in the licensing and/or certification of industrial and organizational psychologists.

Frank Friedlander reported that the Program Committee is to meet soon in order to plan the Division program for the Hawaii meetings.

Mary Tenopyr, reporting for Paul Banas, indicated that the Workshop Committee is planning a half-day session in Hawaii in place of the usual full day workshop. This modification arises from the scheduling of the APA meetings and seeks to accommodate the travel scheduling of our members. Workshops under consideration include: The Legal Aspects of Testing, Job Analysis, The Consultative Process, Organizational Development Change Agency, Behavior Modification, and Managerial Decision-Making.

John Boulger suggested that Art MacKinney be named Associate Editor of TIP immediately and that he become Editor for a three-year term starting this coming September. John also noted that he was giving further consideration to the naming of contributing editors who would replace the Regional Editors of TIP.

Bob Guion reported that several members are being considered for membership on the new Committee on Committees. He noted that there are many volunteers for assignments on the various standing committees and suggested that TIP publish information on how to apply for a committee assignment.

Dick Shore reported that the new Public Policy and Social Issues Committee had held its first meeting. At the meeting many possible issues of concern to our membership were discussed. No specific recommendations were formulated. Further meetings are to be held and Dick indicated that the Committee expected to have recommendations for consideration by the Executive Committee at the June meeting. Dick noted

that the resolutions presented at the Annual Business Meeting last September by Ann Hussein, subsequently published in TIP, are being studied by his Committee. A report to the Executive Committee on the resolutions along with appropriate recommendations will be made in June.

Jack Butler reported that the Public Relations Committee had met and discussed several matters, especially that of establishing relations with the American Society for Personnel Administration and other appropriate organizations. The Committee is also considering distribution of the brochure "A Career in Industrial Psychology" to colleges and universities for consideration by undergraduates who may be considering a career in our field. Jack also noted that the results of the survey conducted by his committee at the Annual Business Meeting in September are to be reported in TIP.

John Campbell reported that the Scientific Affairs Committee had received 16 entries for the Dissertation Award. The entries are currently being reviewed. The Executive Committee voted to award the winner of the award up to \$400 for expenses to the Hawaii meetings. The increase reflected the added expenses involved in attending the Hawaii meetings. John also noted that the Cattell Award brochures had been mailed and that his committee is considering possible additional functions for the committee.

In addition to the committee reports a number of general items were discussed. Doug Bray reported that Don Grant had been named Liaison Representative for the Division to the APA Committee on Psychological Testing. The APA Committee is currently revising the APA manual on standards for psychological testing and is seeking input from all concerned Divisions of the Association. Bob Guion is a member of the APA Committee and will be preparing materials for consideration by the APA Committee and the interested Divisions.

The Executive Committee voted to establish a committee made up of our three Representatives to Council (Don Grant, Bob Perloff and Lyman Porter) to solicit the views of our membership regarding proposed changes in the organization of APA. In this connection, all members of the Division are urged to carefully read the proposals of the Policy and Planning Board of APA titled "Structure and Function of APA: Guidelines for the Future" which appears in the January issue of the American Psychologist (Pages 1 - 10). Additional materials regarding the proposed reorganization are to be made

available and will be mailed to the membership. The Committee of Grant, Perloff and Porter is responsible for deciding on how best to obtain the views of the membership respecting the proposed reorganization and to report to the Executive Committee at its June meeting on the reactions. APA expects a report from our Division by July 1.

Don Grant  
Secretary

<sup>1</sup>Any member wishing a complete copy of the minutes can obtain them by writing the Secretary, Donald L. Grant, 195 Broadway (Room 2122B), New York, New York 10007.

### Changed Your Address Recently?

If so - have you notified APA?

To receive TIP and correspondence concerning Division matters notify APA immediately of any changes of address. Address your envelope or postcard to:

Circulation Department  
American Psychological Association  
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

In addition, put "Address Change" on the envelope or card. Hopefully, these actions will get your correct address on the APA mailing tape in minimal time.



## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Division 14 Workshops

The 20th Annual Division 14 Workshops will be held at the Sheraton Waikiki in Honolulu, Hawaii, Tuesday, September 5, 1972. The sessions and leaders will be as follows:

#### Contingency Management in Training William E. Datel-Section 1

This workshop will be concerned with the design and implementation of a contingency management program based upon the positive operant conditioning model. In particular, problems of identifying and scaling social reinforcers and problems in managing an operational program will be discussed.

Dr. Datel is Psychologist with the Volunteer Army (Volar) Evaluation Group, Directorate of Plans and Training, Fort Ord, California.

#### The Role of Psychologists for the Defense in EEO Court Cases

Howard C. Lockwood-Section 2

This workshop will be concerned with the many questions where an organization's psychologist can be expected to make expert contributions. Do we have a defensible position? How strong is it? What's been found in other court cases? What is our exposure? Should we settle out of court? How must we prepare for our defense and affirmative case? Should we use outside expert witnesses? If so, whom and for what purpose? What questions will we advise our lawyers to ask the plaintiff's psychologists? How can we have effective interaction within the defense team -- psychologists, management officials and lawyers? Emphasis will be on actual cases and experiences.

Mr. Lockwood is Corporate Director--Personnel, Lockheed Aircraft Corp.

#### The Consultative Process Raymond E. Miles-Section 4

In this workshop, Dr. Miles will examine three phases of the consultative process in modern organizations, (1) entry, (2) change mechanisms, and (3) sustaining mechanisms. Attention will be focused on what is known and unknown about these phases and interlinkages. This workshop might have also been entitled, "How Not to Allow Change to Happen?"

Dr. Miles is associated with the Schools of Business Administration and Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California at Berkeley.

#### Job Analysis

Ernest McCormick-Section 5

In this workshop, Dr. McCormick will describe latest developments and various applications of job analysis techniques. Particular attention will be paid to the work of the Occupational Research Center and Dr. McCormick's own approach to defining the dimensions of work.

Dr. McCormick is Professor of Psychology, Purdue University and is associated with the Occupational Research Center.

#### Change Agency

James H. Rae, Jr.-Section 6

In this workshop, Dr. Rae will discuss his actual industrial experiences with the selection and training of change agents. Specific experiences in an organization(s) will be discussed, with participants having an opportunity to gain an understanding of the problems of change agents and change agent management. Dr. Rae is Director of Organization Analysis and Development, General Motors Corporation.

Workshops will be limited to 15 participants. Registration fee will be \$40 for APA members and \$50 for non APA members. If you need further information contact:

Paul A. Banas  
(313) 322-6490  
Room 431, World Headquarters  
Ford Motor Company  
The American Road  
Dearborn, MI 48121

Participants will be assigned to workshops of their choice on the following basis:

#### Registration by May 30

- 1st priority - APA members
- 2nd priority - non APA members

#### Registration after May 30

Date of receipt of registration

## PROGRAM SCHEDULE

1:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Workshop Sessions

6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Conversation and Social Hour\*

-----  
\*The conversation and social hour will be held aboard a harbor cruiser, the Ale Ale Kai V. Because of space limitations, each workshop participant may invite only one "guest" (e.g., wife) to join in the social "hour" - food, beverages, and entertainment. Workshop participants - free; guest-\$10 (enclose payment with registration fee.)

## EARLY REGISTRATION

20th Annual Workshop

in

Industrial and Organizational Psychology

Sheraton Waikiki

September 5, 1972

Please Print

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Rank order below the workshops you would be interested in attending:

- ( ) Contingency Management in Training
- ( ) Role of Psychologists for the Defense in EEP Court Cases
- ( ) Consultative Process
- ( ) Job Analysis
- ( ) Change Agency

ALL SESSIONS ARE LIMITED TO 20 PARTICIPANTS  
REGISTER EARLY

\$40 APA Members

\$50 Non APA Members

\$10 Guest-Social Hour

Make check or money order payable to:

APA DIVISION 14 WORKSHOP

Mail this form with your fee to:

Dr. Mary L. Tenopyr

5303 Danbury Road

Bethesda, Maryland 20014

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Association of Industrial Psychologists of Mexico has extended an invitation of members of Division 14 to the "Primero Congreso Nacional de Psicología Industrial" which is to be held July 20-22 in Mexico, D.F. The Congress has as its objectives:

1. To have an interchange of experiences and knowledge among the professionals of the Industrial Psychology.
2. To learn about the new advancements and achievements in this particular area of psychology.
3. To encourage the research and development of more suitable techniques for the Mexican Community.
4. Identifying the actual situation of Industrial Psychology in Mexico, as well as the forms to encourage its development.
5. To spread adequate information so as to delimit the field of industrial psychology, and the role of psychologists in industry.

Members wishing information concerning the Congress should write:

Lic. Cristina E. de Chevali  
1 Congreso Nacional de Chevali  
Insurgentes Sur. No. 303-202  
Mexico, II, D.F.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations is arranging a program of one-day seminars and workshops for members and is also planning the next Annual Conference which will take place on January 4-6, 1973. The Institute is interested in knowing of any visitors to England during the year, especially during January, 1973. Interested persons should write:

Dr. Frank A. Heller  
Tavistock Institute of Human Relations  
Tavistock Centre, Belsize Lane  
London, N.W. 3.

\* \* \* \* \*

In an attempt to make the title structure more meaningful at LIAMA and to communicate more effectively the areas of specialization, Dr. Paul W. Thayer, Vice President -- Research, announced the following new titles:

Dr. Michael A. Raphael, Associate Scientist -- Training Research

Dr. Albert J. Sheridan, Scientist--Social Research

Dr. Edward J. Sweeney, Senior Scientist -- Manpower Research

This completes the change in titles which took place a few years ago when Dr. John A. Antoinetti was made Research Advisor, Dr. Robert E. Carlson was made Director--Developmental Research, Dr. Eugene C. Mayfield was made Director -- Manpower Research, and Dr. Robert C. Nuckols was made Director -- Consumer Research.

\* \* \* \* \*

Warren S. Blumenfeld was selected by his peers as the Outstanding Member of the Management Department of Georgia State University for the academic year 1970-71. There are currently 41 full-time members of the Faculty at GSU.

\* \* \* \* \*

John D. Drake's Interviewing for Managers has recently been published by the American Management Association.

\* \* \* \* \*

EXEC COM HEARS SURVEY REPORT

At the Executive Committee meeting on January 14, Dr. Mary Tenopyr of the U.S. Civil Service Commission reported the results of her survey of communication practices in Division 14. Dr. Tenopyr undertook the survey over a year ago for the division's Education and Training Committee. Preliminary results are now in and a full summary report will be forthcoming shortly.

Some of the highlights of the survey findings include the apparent fact "that a majority of the respondents are not dissatisfied with present communication practices", according to Dr. Tenopyr. "But", she adds, "the number of persons expressing dissatisfaction is large enough to suggest that some action should be taken to improve communication in the field." The greatest preference for communication modes are informal conversations, journals, and books. Dr. Tenopyr notes, "That here we have the interesting phenomenon of the least structured and the most structured vehicles valued over those of intermediate structure. Reasons are not entirely clear." Conventions, workshops, TIP, and other vehicles are only moderately valued.

"Communications plans for the future should probably emphasize face-to-face communication. More interest was shown in small group meetings than any other mode of communication. Also, improving . . . TIP seems imperative." However, Dr. Tenopyr notes, "There do not seem to be any strong movements for new content in IO psychology. Most respondents seem to want more knowledge about areas which have been part of the field for a number of years." Dr. Tenopyr reports that there were pleas for "more realism" which seems to reflect a desire for more information on topics of particular interest to the practitioner in industry.

Other highlights include the following:

- the average IO psychologist holds regular conversations with only 13 people.
- most journal reading is confined to three major journals: JAP, American Psychologist, and Personnel Psychology.
- the APA convention and TIP are more highly regarded for nontechnical than technical communication.
- the favored types of programs at conventions include conversation hours, symposia, and seminars.

- the idea of regional workshops was endorsed by a substantial number of respondents.
- first preference in TIP articles seems to be for news on who's doing what, professional notes and news, reports about research in progress, division and committee business.
- there seems to be a clear preference for TIP to be issued on a regular schedule.

\* \* \* \* \*

THE DEMAND FOR SERVICES -- AN INFORMAL SURVEY<sup>1</sup>

George P. Hollenbeck  
The Psychological Corporation

Most of us relish the opportunity to get out to learn what others are doing, but we seldom get the chance. In the fall of 1971, I had the enviable task of doing just that. My task was to look at the current demand for industrial and organizational psychological services, trying to get a perspective on where things are and where they are going.

The result was an informal study in which I talked with about 40 behavioral scientists, mostly psychologists. Most of my interviewees were in the New York metropolitan area, but I also talked to people in the Southeast, the Midwest, and West Coast. I asked three basic questions:

- 1) What are you doing?
- 2) What needs to be done?
- 3) If you were going into the consulting business, what would you do?

Sometimes I got different answers to each of these questions. The discussion that follows is a synthesis resulting from the sifting and winnowing of the answers to these and other questions.

My discussion will not really be a "future-think," although today's demand is probably a good indicator of important things for tomorrow. Also, we cannot consider directions in which things are going without some future-think. Fortunately, our future-think has been done well for us in papers by Barrett, Bass and Dunnette (1970), Herb Meyer (1971), and Phillip Shay (1971).

Rather than look at these long-term trends and assess what are the likely changes in psychology, I looked at what is going on today and tried to integrate this with the long-term trends. I want to be more specific than most of the futurists have been, and to indicate some of the behavioral science responses to social changes.

To organize things, consider the three levels where the psychologist typically intervenes in organizational activity: the person level; the job level; and the organizational level. At the person level he may be concerned with selection, training, placement, or counseling. At the job level, his concerns may include job enrichment, simplification or enlargement, human engineering, and job analysis. At the organization level, he deals with studies of communication patterns, structure, design and development. Behavioral scientists have also been active in looking at the environment in which the organization operates, through such things as social indicators, consumer psychology, studies of inter-organizational relationships, and restraints upon an organization. My discussion will not be very much concerned with this external environment.

Before considering demand in each of the areas of intervention, I want to mention an overriding issue which kept coming up in my interviews -- manpower utilization. To a large extent this came down to "motivation." From a manager's perspective, it was "how do I get my employees to do what I want them to?" From an industrial psychologist's perspective, it was more "what can be done so that people will maximize their efforts and increase their self-fulfillment?" From an organizational perspective, it was "how do we increase productivity?" This issue, motivating people, kept "rearing its ugly head." If one could define "motivation," measure it, and develop training programs which motivated employees, one would be rewarded handsomely.

#### Intervention at the Person Level

A strong demand still exists for selection services. This may come as something of a surprise to many people who, five years ago, thought that selection problems were losing importance. Two reasons account for this demand: the economy and Federal legislation. The recent recession has resulted in many applicants for every available job. For example, when a small town in California needed a police chief, it had over 40 applicants. With this many applications, psychologists were called upon to help with selection. In addition to the economy as a factor, we have legislation, typified by the EEOC/OFCC. One "unintended consequence" of the activities of these agencies has been employment of psychologists by industries concerned about meeting federal guidelines. However, no one has really answered the question: "how do we use tests in today's environment?" Our stock answer has been

"validate." But the same old validation problems are still with us, and these are especially pertinent for the small company. One important recent development has been the American Petroleum Institute's handbook How to Install and Validate Employee Selection Techniques (Osburne and Wilfredo, 1971). I question whether this will work as a "how-to" cookbook for personnel managers, however, since it is a "meaty" document that many psychologists can no doubt learn from. Also, there are just too many vagaries of validation to allow the how-to manual to stand alone. Another problem is that the standard validation model is simply not very helpful when dealing with small numbers of cases in uncontrolled situations.

As a result of lack of answers to these problems, some psychologists working in the selection area are apathetic. Several people mentioned the near impossibility of doing a study that will satisfy the EEOC. There is a recognition that validity may not be crucial; the real issue is the number of people hired. Apathy has lead some to think that testing is on its way out. My interviews suggested at least two reasons why this is not true, however. First, if "numbers hired" is the important thing, we still need to choose the best to hire from the applicant pool. Second, whatever is true of tests is also true of other selection instruments. Many people have not yet begun to realize that, once they give up tests, their problems with the EEOC will concentrate in other areas. The issue of testing may really be a red herring that diverts us from the main question.

In the selection area we see the beginnings of the systems viewpoint to which Herb Meyer has referred in his APA address. Tests are beginning to be seen as a part of an employment system. This employment system involves the employee from the time he learns about a company to the time he is seated at the job. In this interval we have recruiting, initial contact, interviewing, testing, training, and job placement within the organization. Placed in this perspective, testing is only a small part of the total operation. Perhaps I am optimistic in seeing a demand here, since I feel that this is the approach we should be taking. However, if this demand is indeed there, the demand for help in other areas than testing will certainly grow.

A specific area of demand is for help in selecting the disadvantaged. There is no collection of wisdom here, no place where a person can go and get answers to all his problems -- recruiting, selection, training, etc. Several people I



talked to indicated that they felt companies would not spend money here. But, many companies are already spending, and they want advice on what to do. A related need is in answering the question "how do we integrate the organization?" Although many companies have hired minority employees, one of the problems they are finding now is that blacks go to one side of the cafeteria, whites go to the other side of the cafeteria, and never the twain shall meet. The groups then reinforce each other's stereotypes. The unanswered question is: "how do you change the people, or change the organization, to accommodate this problem?"

One would think that there would be a big demand for help in selecting women. Interestingly enough, I did not find much concern here. I personally feel that this will be a major area of concern. Considering some of Bass's (1971) recent work, he must think so, too. However, so far there seems to be little general concern and interest.

In the area of management selection, assessment centers are, of course, the major interest. Large companies often have their own staffs which do assessments. One of the problems is how do we satisfy the demand for management selection of the small and medium-sized companies. Assessment materials are now available from several places, such as AMA, Development Dimensions and others, but these are still directed toward assessment centers handling large numbers of candidates. Dunnette's approach has been to have people from different companies come to a single assessment center, but no one really knows what this does to assessment center judgments. There is a lot of demand for help in setting up, using, and implementing the assessment center approach.

Assessment centers present validation problems along with a great need for research into what is being measured and what are the unique things that the assessment center offers. I find it incredible that while we are unwilling to generalize that a mechanical comprehension test will predict success in a similar job in two different companies, we are, at the same time, perfectly willing to use a management assessment center for two separate companies with very complex managerial jobs and to assume validity. In fact, it is generally amazing that when one gets into the managerial area most psychologists tend to forget about, or at least suppress, validity problems.

One alternative to management assessment centers, individual assessments, is still in demand. However, assessment centers do provide types of information not obtained in indi-

vidual assessments. To what extent the additional information increases the validity or reliability of judgments is not generally known.

Another area at the person intervention level is placement. There seems to be a shifting emphasis from selection to placement. This changeover is really a result of other trends, including the changing motives of people, constraints on organizational policy, and project management approaches. There is a tendency to see placement as the larger issue and to be concerned with where within an organization people best fit. In one case a company was offering vocational or career guidance services to anyone in the company who had been employed over a year. They were coupling this with a very liberal education policy designed to solve the problem that there was really no place for a large group of 20-25 year-olds to go within the company. Instead of retaining an unhappy group of people, the company was encouraging them to further their education and get into other occupations. I think this will be a continuing trend. The changing motives of people are reflected in the fact that more and more people want to change occupations or careers at age 30, 40, or 50, and this will result in an increase in the need for placement services.

Another area is training. Demand in training is at last shifting to an emphasis on "learning something." There is a great deal more concern with behavioral objectives, cost effectiveness, and "what does one get out of a training program." It used to be easy to offer training programs which taught general things like "attitudes." Now people are much more concerned with the specific learnings which take place, and with being able to take something back to their organizations that they can do. In fact, one person indicated that he thought the performance contracting approach seen in some school systems will spread to industry, where training will be paid for only if learning takes place. Especially in the disadvantaged area one can see a need for training and training methods. However, there does not seem to be a lot of demand for this. Psychologists often are not involved in companies' efforts to train disadvantaged, these efforts being run by regular training staffs.

In the management training area there seems to be an insatiable demand for training directed toward any of the more or less traditional management problems. One interesting area is the decision-making area, and here Victor Vroom (1971) indicated that he has been doing research and developing

materials to assess and train managers in decision - making. Vroom seems to have a very attractive approach to helping a manager decide when to make decisions himself and when to involve his subordinates. Another area of some interest is in helping managers to monitor and diagnose their own organizations, rather than depend upon the behavioral scientist.

In general, behavior modification is thought of by many as the "hope of the future" in the training area. In fact, if one could come up with a good, validated behavior modification program in the managerial area, one would undoubtedly have a sell-out. All sorts of other training needs came up, but many of these were specific to certain companies. These included supervisory training, interviewer training, and so on. The overall emphasis is upon training which has been evaluated and which takes a behavior orientation. Although sensitivity training is in the training area, I want to put that off until the discussion of organizational development.

#### Intervention at the Job Level

The second area of intervention is at the job level. Here the most important thing appears to be job enrichment. When your area of interest gets an article in the Sunday New York Times and in the Wall Street Journal within the same month, you know you have really made it! The demand seems to be one which will continue to grow, and is a response to one of the changes predicted by the futurists -- job content will become more important as a motivator. However, there is a feeling that we need to get the "religious" aura out of job enrichment, and sometimes it is a little hard to figure out what actually goes on. Apparently, most frequently it involves teaching managers to work with employees in restructuring their jobs. Some behavior scientists have had problems selling job enrichment within their organizations, especially to managers who have no interest in changing the way things are done. However, all signs point to the fact that this is going to be an area of growing importance.

Job analysis is usually thought of in the selection context, but it can be seen as intervention at the job level. If we think of ourselves as organizational rather than just industrial psychologists, we can see interest in job analysis in "non-industrial" areas such as health-care delivery. In many of the health-care areas there has been a growing concern with the skills required and the tasks which go into high performance of a health-care team.

#### Intervention at the Organization Level

At the organization level, the area of greatest interest is clearly OD, organizational development. Talking with people, I found it hard to get a handle on organization development. In his Division 14 Workshop at APA, Herb Shephard pointed out that he viewed organization development as a philosophy, an approach to an organization which helps the individual to be more in charge of himself, to use his emotions in his job, and to be more flexible, adaptable, and able to fulfill himself in work. Herb indicated that OD was concerned with temporary systems, reward systems that foster trust, and ways of organizing. Some people view OD as a set of techniques, even equating sensitivity training with OD. Although I have listed it here under intervention at the organization level, sensitivity training really works on the individual. It has had some problems, however. One of these is that the organization is frequently unwilling to subject its people to stressful personal situations. This may seem strange when managers are subjected to stressful personal situations all the time, but, perhaps, the difference is that sensitivity training imposes personal rather than work-related situations. Another problem is that the results from sensitivity training have not clearly indicated that organizations work more effectively after sensitivity training. Still, there seems to be a demand for training. At least one organization which trains indicates that, after a dip in interest over the last year or two, recent enrollment has been going up.

An observation here is that the most successful OD people seem to be what might be called "university-types" -- they are pipe-smoking, tweedy, soft-spoken, and naturally give the impression that your problems are their problems. It may be easy for such a consultant to tell the company president "you can't run the company the way you're doing it." He has a firm base within the university and more clients than he can handle. It is much harder, however, for the internal OD development man to speak up. At APA I met several unemployed OD people who had been victims of either the dip in the economy or the problems of running an internal OD staff, or both. That internal OD groups create stress within companies does not seem to be an isolated phenomenon. And one response to stress is to amputate the offending member.

Despite these problems, apparently the world really is changing in ways which OD attempts to address. And, little by little, the word is getting to top management. For example

we see evidence of this in a number of Harvard Business Review articles in the last year or two concerned with changing values of employees. Companies are beginning to experience problems in identification, flexibility of employees, and dealing with change. Although many companies are most concerned now with immediate profits, with an economic upswing we can expect more interest in changing organizations to meet future needs. If they must change as fast as anticipated, we will see more OD activities and more demand for work on organization structure and team management -- changing the managerial role from that of a boss to that of a resource coordinator.

Another area which seems to fit into the organization is compensation programs. Psychologists have offered little toward designing compensation programs which reward rather than punish. This is a part of the general concern with motivation, and psychologists have a role to play in studying compensation systems and coming up with systems that work.

Attitude surveys are one of our traditional tools of organizational intervention. They are still with us even though perspectives of my sample varied widely. The day of the big census survey on a one-shot basis has passed. Emphasis now is on comparative surveys which focus on particular issues and which result in reports that management can act on. If survey results are to be meaningful, we need comparative data either between organizations or over time. The massive surveys of the late 1950's and early 1960's too often were one-time things which provided results with little meaning. Although many companies have stopped using surveys, one person mentioned a company's actually using survey results to supplement profit results in managerial evaluation. So, there is a demand for surveys and it is likely to be with us as the concern for monitoring employee attitudes continues.

Outside of these three areas of intervention are the requirements of the external environment on the organization. There will be more demand for the psychologist to function as a monitor, informing the organization about environmental changes. Consumer interests are certainly much more important than previously, and organizations are learning to respond. Although I have slighted consumer psychology, there are those who feel that it can bridge this gap between the organization and its environment. Apparently, psychologists will be involved in figuring out how the organization affects the outside, and how the outside affects the organization.

In conclusion, an interesting sidelight is that psychologists were uniformly optimistic about the state of the econo-

my. Although they were often in a period of "tight budgets and no head count," they were nonetheless confident that the immediate concern with profits was going to be replaced by concern with broader problems of manpower utilization. Let's hope they are right!

#### REFERENCES

- Barrett, G. V., Bass, B. M., and Dunnette, M. D. Industrial Psychology in the Seventies and Beyond. Office of Naval Research, Technical Report No. 4005, 1970.
- Bass, B. M. Development and Evaluation of Some New Self-Guided Exercises in Management Development. Address to the Metropolitan New York Association for Applied Psychology, October 27, 1971.
- Meyer, H. The Future for Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Oblivion or Millennium? Presidential address to Division 14, Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C. 1971.
- Osburn, H. G. and Wilfredo, R. M. How to Install and Validate Employee Selection Techniques. Washington, D. C. American Petroleum Institute, 1971.
- Shay, P. W. Management Consulting in the 1970's and Beyond. New York: Association of Consulting Management Engineers, Inc., 1971.
- Vroom, V. and Yetton, P. The Social Structure of Decision Making; A Study of Leadership Methods in Industrial Organizations. Invited Address: Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C. 1971.

---

<sup>1</sup>A talk given to the Metropolitan New York Association for Applied Psychology, January 13, 1972.

# ADVERTISING INFORMATION AND RATE SHEET, AUGUST 1971

## GENERAL INFORMATION

TIP, The Industrial Psychologist, a publication devoted to professional developments in the field of industrial and organizational psychology. Serves as Newsletter of Division 14 of APA and is a forum for the discussion of issues and challenges facing the profession. Published three times per year — Fall, Spring, and Summer.

Guaranteed circulation of 1,800. TIP is sent to leaders of the field in the industrial and academic communities, and to the most influential members of the American Psychological Association — APA Officers, The Board of Directors, Presidents of all Divisions of APA and Editors of all psychological Newsletters. TIP is also distributed to advanced graduate students of industrial psychology and to libraries and graduate schools training industrial psychologists.

## RATES PER INSERTION

Size of Ad	Number of Insertions	
	One Time	Three Times
Two-page spread	\$200	\$180
Cover	150	135
One Page	125	110
Half Page	75	70

## AGENCY DISCOUNT

15%

## PLATE SIZES

Size of Ad	Vertical	Horizontal
One Page	7½"	4½"
Half Page	3½"	4½"

## OTHER INFORMATION

Printed by offset on offset stock, saddle stitch binding.

## CLOSING DATES

February 15, June 15, and October 15.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Ordering and  
Contract Arrangements:

Sample Copies, or  
Additional Information:

## CALL or WRITE

GEORGE S. SPEER,  
Business Manager, TIP  
Institute for Psychological Services  
Illinois Institute of Technology  
55 East 33rd Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60616

JOHN R. BOULGER, Ph.D.  
Editor, TIP  
c/o James N. Farr & Associates  
301 Piedmont Building  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27401

## TELEPHONE

(312) 225-9600

or

(919) 274-8483  
Res. (919) 292-7475

## I AM NEVER STARTLED BY A FISH<sup>1</sup>

Warren S. Blumenfeld  
Georgia State University

Most of us would probably agree that, in the area of managerial selection, what is lacking most is the availability of valid non-cognitive predictors. Further, most would agree that tailor-made, special keys are to be preferred to universal, general keys. The combination of the two seems desirable and appropriate. However, as Kurtz pointed out so well in 1948, too often the wishes and hopes of the practitioner and/or the consumer manifest themselves in a strange form of selective perception in the evaluation of effectiveness of such keys, i.e., the acceptance of self-fulfilling "research" via foldback design.

Purpose. The purpose of this research was to develop and validate concurrently a special tailor-made key for a relatively new and exciting personality instrument in a group of potential managers. A secondary (sic) purpose of this research was to point out once again the specious, spurious, fallacious, but fascinating results that are obtained when cross-validation does not follow item analysis.

Data Collection. The subjects, criterion, and instrument follow.

The subjects in this experiment were 126 management majors in an introductory management course at Georgia State University. The instrument administration was presented to them as an example of a "scientific" selection technique (very much as charlatans present their wares to unwary personnel and marketing executives). From all indications, it was accepted as such (just as it is usually accepted by "hard-nosed businessmen"). These subjects may be viewed as entry level managers, or at least potential managers, i.e., personnel and marketing executives, hard-nosed businessmen, etc., etc.

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Blumenfeld read this paper at the George Psychological Association in May, 1972, under the title, Quasi-successful concurrent validation of a special key for a relatively new and exciting personality instrument in a group of potential managers: or I am never startled by a fish. The author wishes to acknowledge the data collection and analysis contributions of Allen Austin and Julian Eidson.



The criterion in this study was self-reported grade point average of the subjects.

The relatively new and exciting (if not sensational) personality instrument used in this study was the North Dakota Null-Hypothesis Brain Inventory (NDNHB I), conjured up and conceived by (Art) Buchwald (1965) with a sharp tongue and a great deal of cheek in answer to the problems of face validity encountered by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. The NDNHB I consists of 36 statements<sup>1</sup> of a non-cognitive nature to which the respondent indicates either true or false as being a descriptive of himself.

In the original article, Buchwald presented a differential psychometric scatter scoring system for placement in either the Peace Corps, the Voice of America, or the White House. In the current research, as indicated by the purpose, an appropriate configuration which concurrently related to an external criterion was developed and quasi-validated.

Data Analysis. There were three phases to the data analysis of this research, i.e., (1) item analysis, (2) fold-back, and (3) cross-validation.

The 36 items in the NDNHB I were item analyzed using the procedure described by Lawshe and Baker (1950) with an external criterion of self-reported grade point average. A skew in the criterion distribution categories necessitated that the high and low "halves" of the criterion group be of different sizes. In the item analysis, there were 48 in the high group, and 28 in the low group. Alpha of .10 was used to identify the "discriminating" items for inclusion in the "special" key.

To prove to the proponents of the instrument (of which there were a few) and to those who really "wanted" the key to work (several students with an apparent clinical bent), the items surviving the item analysis were applied to the answer sheets of the item analysis group. The concurrent validity was documented by biserial correlation.

For those more interested in the best (rather than the most fulfilling) estimate of the relationship between the derived key and the external criterion of self-reported grade point average, the items surviving the item analysis were scored in holdout groups of 25 high answer sheets and 25 low answer sheets. Again, biserial correlation was obtained to quantify the relationship between the special key and the criterion.

<sup>1</sup>Those wishing a copy of the NDNHB I may write either Art Buchwald or Dr. Blumenfeld.

The item analysis procedure identified 9 items (chance would have been 4) which discriminated between the high and low groups at or beyond the .10 level. The reader will no doubt be interested in which items "came through," particularly as the potential for post hoc interpretations and insights are nearly infinite. The items (and their weights) in the special key were:

1. (-) My sex life is A-okay.
2. (+) When I look down from a high spot, I want to spit.
3. (-) I think most people would cry to gain a point.
4. (+) I am never startled by a fish.
5. (+) My mother's uncle was a good man.
6. (+) I don't like it when somebody is rotten.
7. (+) I have never gone to pieces over the weekend.
8. (+) Most of the time I go to sleep without saying goodby.
9. (+) It's hard for me to say the right thing when I find myself in a room full of mice.

Applying these 9 items back upon the original sample, the obtained biserial correlation was .78. This is clearly off zero beyond the .05 level, -- most encouraging to all, and completely satisfactory, convincing, and conclusive to some (Kurtz, 1948). (Consider here for a moment those of your acquaintance and/or your employ using this foldback design and at this point mouthing such quasi-professional, and sage, things as "of course, these results should be interpreted with some caution.")

Unfortunately, when the 9-item key was applied to the holdout sample of 50, the encouraging coefficient of .78 shrank slightly. In fact, it shrank back to .07 (not significantly off zero at the .05 level). Too bad; pity; so many of the items seemed to have so much construct validity, and were so rich in potential for post hoc interpretations and insights, e.g., "I am never startled by a fish."

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Little if any discussion seems necessary; Cureton's classic paper (1952) has been re-trotted out and executed. It seems clear once again that (1) the application of a key to the control group is the acid test of the quality of a key and (2) the (re)application of a key to the original group is but a half-acid test.

To a sophisticated group like this, this would seem to be "coals to New Castle;" however, as an industrial psychologist in a business school dealing with students of business administration (and naive practitioners and consumers of business administration), it is painfully clear to me that the foldback design still remains very much in vogue. (Afterall, it has such obvious marketing advantages.) I think it appropriate to continue to beat home the point of cross-validation, i.e., let's have no more of this half-acid research.

In conclusion, the foldback design is not (necessarily) dead; it is very much alive and doing quite well among the malicious and the naive in the general business world.

And frankly, I am always startled by a fish - particularly when the "fish" turns out to be a personnel or marketing executive.

#### References

- Buchwald, A. My eyes are cold: Testing in the great society. Author, 1965.
- Cureton, E. E. Reliability, validity, and baloney. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1950, 10, 94-96.
- Kurtz, A. K. A research test for the Rorschach test. Personnel Psychology, 1948, 1, 41-51.
- Lawshe, C. H., & Baker, P. C. Three aids in the evaluation of the significance of the difference between percentages. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1950, 10, 263-270.

#### PROFESSIONAL NOTE

APA Convention --- 1972

The forthcoming APA Convention in Hawaii is proving to be a popular one in terms of numbers of papers and symposia submitted for the Program. Seventy-two papers and symposia were sent in --- the largest number that we have had for several years. This made the task of the Program Committee a difficult one. We finally selected about one-third of the papers and symposia for inclusion in the final Program. Because of the selection ratio, a number of good papers and symposia could not be accepted. We are hopeful they will be resubmitted next year or presented at other meetings.

The Program does look promising this year. There are papers on expectancy theory, employee-centered motivation, job satisfaction, decision making, leadership, training for the hard-core, communication, promotions, and use of video tape. Among the symposia topics are work analysis, social responsibilities of industrial psychologists, legal and courtroom issues, organizational communication, interorganizational systems analysis, basic measurement systems, test validation under Government regulations, contingency leadership models, employment interviews, information processing, and women in the work force.

All programs are scheduled for the earlier part of each day (9 AM to 2 PM). This leaves ample time for Division 14 members to satisfy their more leisurely needs on the beaches of Waikiki during the afternoons and their further recreational needs in the evening hours. We're looking forward to seeing many of you at this year's Convention.

Frank Friedlander (Chairman)  
Lew Albright  
C. J. Bartlett  
Michael Beer  
William Byham  
Jack Brenner  
Mildred E. Katzell

## REPORT ON DIVISION 14 PUBLIC RELATIONS SURVEY

The bylaws of the Division of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (Revision approved in September, 1970) include various standing committees. The bylaws read (Article VII, #7):

"The Committee on Public Relations shall promote the interests of the Division and its members by the development of contacts with business and industry, with other professional groups, and with the public in general. Specifically, the Committee on Public Relations shall: (a) encourage or otherwise arrange for appropriate publication relating to industrial and organizational psychology, as for example, articles in journals, magazines, pamphlets, or newspapers; (b) encourage or otherwise arrange for other types of public contacts, such as speakers to appear before business, professional, or public groups; and (c) perform whatever other continuing or special functions it considers desirable to maintain satisfactory relations with business and industry, with other professions, and with the public in general."

The November, 1970 issue of TIP included an "open letter" to the membership, soliciting your ideas, reactions and suggestions in helping the PR Committee reach its objectives. This proved to be a futile effort, as we received a zero response from the membership (significant at the .0001 level!)

In an attempt to remedy the situation, a brief questionnaire was developed, distributed and collected, during the Division 14 Business Meeting in Washington, D.C. on September 4th. The meeting was attended by an estimated 300 psychologists. We collected 114 questionnaires. This represents about a third of those attending the meeting, and approximately 10% of the Division 14 membership. We realize the questionnaire left much to be desired and that you receive too many questionnaires/surveys anyway. However, we wanted some reaction (any reaction!) from the membership. The disappointing return from those attending the meeting, coupled with the zero response from our appeal in TIP; makes us wonder whether you want or require a PR Committee. Due to time deadlines, we couldn't develop an "ideal" questionnaire, and it is doubtful whether the results would have been much different.

Of the 114 responses received, 50% are employed in industry, 29% are affiliated with a university, 13% are in pri-

vate practice and 8% are employed with government. In terms of geographical areas represented, 45% were from the east, 31% midwest, 12% south and 12% west. Two colleagues were from Canada and one didn't know where he was from! Division 14 members showed a 68% response, 20% fellows and 12% associates. The mean/median age was 40, with six members not wishing to comment on age.

Overall responses to the questions were as follows:

1. "To which of the following audiences do you believe the Public Relations Committee should devote the majority of its' time and energy?"

Potential employers won this race by about three lengths. Current employers "placed" (ranked second) with University Business and Industrial Psychology Departments "showed" (ranked third). Potential Industrial Psychology students (4th) and Industrial Psychologists (5th) were "out of the money" and ran poorly. Several other "entries" were listed and included government (5 starters), public and community (2 entries) and general policy and education.

2. If you had one choice only, which of the following areas of industrial psychology should receive the most publicity?" A rank order of the areas is shown below and the parentheses indicate the number of responses:

Rank	Area
1	Selection, psychometrics (28)
2.5	Management and supervisor development (19)
2.5	Adapting the working environment (19)
4	Other (items listed below) - (16)
5	Human resources accounting (14)
6	Morale improvement (5)
7	Mental health (4)
8.5	Training techniques (2)
8.5	Rehabilitation and counseling (2)
10.5	Man-machine interface (1)
10.5	Wage and labor relations (1)

Areas listed as "other" included Organizational Development (6), Fair Employment (3), Equal Employment Opportunity (3), Social Action (2) and other items such as management of change, productivity improvement, manpower planning, decision making, job design, motivation, decision making and organizational structure.

3. "Where do you think the future emphasis of the field of Industrial Psychology should be?" A rank order and number of responses are shown below. "Other" included several responses by some individuals.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Area</u>
1	Provide management with a sophisticated understanding of the employee and his behavior (56).
2.5	Social-community problems (21)
2.5	Produce greater employee job satisfaction (21)
4	"Other" (see below) - (18)
5	Produce greater industrial efficiency (10)

"Other" included write in areas such as organizational development, better understanding among members of organizations, performance measures, school-community issues, social-industrial problems, social justice, executive leadership and acceptance of I/O psychologists.

4. "Which of the following areas of psychology do you think will have the greatest impact upon Industrial Psychology of the future?"

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Area</u>
1	69%	Social
2	16%	Measurement and psychometrics
3	9%	"Other"
4	6%	Experimental

Listed under "other" were clinical, personality, sociological, community, environmental and organizational psychology.

5. "Where should the major emphasis of the industrial psychologist be placed?"

Industry received a 71% response rate, followed by Community Service (10%), University Teaching (10%) and Full-time research (9%). Several respondents checked all of the above while some wrote none or ?.

6. "Should the Division P.R. Committee stay in existence?"

Yes - 69%  
No - 6%  
? - 25%

Several colleagues indicated they had no knowledge of what the PR Committee does (Bylaws above), questioned the goals and objectives of the committee and obviously did not read TIP!!!

7. "Any additional comments you care to make?"

About 30 comments were received. Five mentioned how poorly the questionnaire was constructed. We received two "right on" comments. Several members wanted us to identify our public and "tell it like it is." Publication in business journals was mentioned and encouraged. A few expressed

their desire to serve on committees (write Doug Bray, Room 2121, AT&T Company, 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10007).

Art Drucker made a few cross-analyses of the data. He found that almost all of the 33 colleagues affiliated with a university felt the P.R. Committee should concentrate its time and energy (Question #1) on University Business and Industrial Psychology Departments.

He also split the group by age to determine if the younger generation had different thoughts/reactions than our more experienced colleagues. Art being over 40, doesn't trust anyone under 40! He determined the age mean of the outgoing PR Committee to be 540 months (age 45) and of questionable I.Q. He found the over 40 generation were more prone to suggest "other", while the under 40 group were more likely to accept the alternatives offered on the questionnaire and had less "write-in" comments. The younger group chose social areas of psychology will have the greatest impact upon industrial psychology more than our elder statesmen. The elders wanted to keep the Committee in existence while the youngsters more often marked No or ?. We would like to encourage the younger members to get on committees (any committee) to consider some of the changes they desire.

Members on the Public Relations Committee this past year included John L. Butler, Stanley L. Cohen, Arthur J. Drucker, Eugene Schmuckler and J. E. Uhlaner. John Butler will serve as chairman for the oncoming year.

I have enjoyed serving on the committee these past five years. I hope that many of you will join committees and express your opinions and reactions. The only time we hear from you is at the annual meeting or when you have a specific gripe. Why not get involved in Division affairs? You can help improve our image --- no committee can do it for you. So as a final note --- "Join the unhooked (uninvolved?) generation! Volunteer for a committee this year and get where the action is (or should be)! Division 14 is an Equal Opportunity Employer!

Sincerely,

*Frank W. Uhlman*

Frank W. Uhlman,  
Outgoing Chairman  
P.R. Committee



### Editor's Note

Effective with this issue, Art MacKinney is Associate Editor of TIP and soon he will be replacing me as Editor. I know that he will be very happy to have your suggestions, comments and help in making TIP a better newsletter. I have enjoyed very much working on TIP and appreciate all of the support from the members.

JB

### DIVISION 14 OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE — 1971-1972

President	Douglas W. Bray
President-Elect	Robert Gufon
Past President	Herbert H. Meyer
Secretary-Treasurer	Donald L. Grant

#### Representatives to

##### APA Council:

Donald L. Grant (1969-1972)  
Robert Perloff (1971-1974)  
Lynmar W. Porter (1970-1973)

#### Member at Large of

##### Executive Committee

Marvin D. Dunnette (1969-1972)  
Wayne K. Kirchner (1971-1974)  
Joseph Weitz (1970-1973)

#### Fellowship

Ralph R. Canter, Chairman  
Edwin Fleishman  
James C. Naylor  
Joseph Weitz

#### Membership

James R. Glennon, Chairman  
John M. Larsen  
Benjamin Schneider  
Patricia A. Smith

#### Education and Training

Edward E. Lawler, III, Chairman  
Richard J. Campbell  
Robert E. Carlson  
H. Peter Dachler  
Abraham K. Korman  
Allen I. Kraut  
Robert D. Prehara  
Mary L. Tenopir  
Mark D. VanSlyke

#### Program

Frank Friedlander, Chairman  
Lewis Albright  
C. J. Bartlett  
Michael Beer  
Marshall H. Brenner  
William C. Byham  
Mildred E. Katzell

#### Workshop

Paul A. Banas, Chairman  
Richard L. Cherry  
Milton D. Hakel  
Robert F. Morrison  
A. Terrence Pohn  
Virginia E. Sehein  
Mark B. Silber  
Mary L. Tenopir  
James A. Thurber

#### Scientific Affairs

John P. Campbell, Chairman  
Milton R. Blood  
David C. Bowers  
Charles L. Hulin  
Wayne K. Kirchner  
Joseph L. Moses  
Lynmar W. Porter  
Karlene A. Roberts

#### Newsletter

John R. Boulger

#### Professional Affairs

C. Paul Sparks, Chairman  
Patricia J. Dyer  
Kenneth F. Schenkel  
Robert B. Selover  
Fred Wickert

#### Public Policy and Social Issues

Richard P. Shore, Chairman

#### Public Relations

John L. Butler, Chairman  
Stanley L. Cohen  
Olga Engelhardt  
Eugene Schmuucker  
Bruce A. Springborn  
Frank M. Sterne  
Frank W. Uhlmann  
J. William Benschel

#### Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Student Fellowships

Henry R. Brenner, Co-Chairman  
Forrest W. Fryer, Co-Chairman  
Ralph R. Canter  
James R. Glennon  
Edwin H. Henry  
L. Richard Hoffman  
Raymond A. Katzell  
A. C. MacKinney  
P. W. Maloney  
Herbert H. Meyer  
William A. Owens, Jr.  
Jack A. Parrish  
Robert Perloff  
Ross Stagner  
Joseph Weitz

#### Ad Hoc Committee on Liaison with Amer. Soc. for Pers. Admin.

William A. Owens, Jr., Chairman